



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/587,870

12/18/2006

Heikki Heikkila

17195Z

2548

23389 7590 10/21/2009  
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC  
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA  
SUITE 300  
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER

HANLEY, SUSAN MARIE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1651

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/21/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



### **DETAILED ACTION**

The previous restriction requirement is vacated and the time period is reset with the mailing date of the following restriction requirement.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-61, drawn to a first method for recovering arabinose from a vegetable fiber.

Group II, claim(s) 62-71, 80 and 81, drawn to a method for crystallizing arabinose.

Group III, claim(s) 72-77, drawn to crystalline arabinose.

The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

(a) An international or national stage application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept. Where a group of inventions is claimed in an application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those invention involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

(b) An international or a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations of categories:

(1) a product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; or

Art Unit: 1651

- (2) a product and a process of use of said product; or
- (3) a product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and a use of the said product; or
- (4) a process and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out said process; or
- (5) a product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out said process.

The groups of invention I and III fall within category (1), a product and a method of making of that product.

PCT Rule 13.2 does not provide for multiple compositions or multiple methods of use or making within a single application. Thus, the first appearing composition is combined with a corresponding first method of making and the additional method claims each constitute a separate group.

In addition to the requirement that a group of inventions must belong to one of the specific categories provided by PCT Rule 13.2, the inventions in the category, such as a composition and a method of making of the composition, must have a special technical feature that unites them. See Patent Rules 1.475, where a special technical feature is a contribution OVER THE PRIOR ART.

Thus, the inventions listed as Groups I and III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features as demonstrated above. Since the composition crystalline L-arabinose is known in the art, see US 4,816,078, which discloses the isolation and crystallization of L-arabinose from sugar beet pulp, no special technical feature unites these inventions in a category. It is noted that US 4,816,078 is silent as to the melting point purity of the crystalline arabinose but meets the claimed limitations (crystalline L-arabinose) which indicates that the claimed characteristics should be present in the prior art invention as also as those instantly claimed. In this case, burden is shifted to the Applicant to distinguish the instant

Art Unit: 1651

invention over the prior art. It is noted that In re Best (195 USPQ 430) and In re Fitzgerald (205 USPQ 594) discuss the support of rejections wherein the prior art discloses subject matter which there is reason to believe inherently includes functions that are newly cited or is identical to a product instantly claimed. In such a situation the burden is shifted to the applicants to "prove that subject matter shown to be in the prior art does not possess characteristic relied on" (205 USPQ 594, second column, first full paragraph).

The expression "special technical feature" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art (PCT Rule 13.2). Thus, a feature found in the prior art cannot be considered to be a special technical feature.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

Art Unit: 1651

If Group I is elected Applicant is required to elect:

A. If the various optional steps of neutralization and fractionization are each not or are performed.

If Applicant elects that the fractionization step is practiced, Applicant must elect if one or more fraction are enriched in poly-, oligo- and/or disaccharides.

B. The source of the vegetable rich fiber from one of:

- i. an exudate gum (if this specie is elected, Applicant is required to elect the type of gum from one of claim 5.
- ii. a sugar beet pulp (claim 6);
- iii. a hardwood bark (requires further election from claim 8), grain straw and husks, corn (includes corned cobs and corn fibers) or bagasse (claim 7); or
- iv. water soluble or alkali soluble vegetable fiber (claim 9)

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Specie A corresponds to claim 1.

Specie B corresponds to claims 4-9.

The following claim(s) are generic:

For specie A, claims 1-61 are generic.

For specie B, claims 1-3 and 10-61 are generic.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: For specie A, the additional of optional steps to the basic method adds steps of doing an action (e.g., neutralization or fractionization) that are not part of the basic method. The basic method can be practiced without neutralization and fractionation. Hence, there is not special technical feature of

Art Unit: 1651

the optional steps with the steps of the basic method. For specie B, the sources of vegetable fibers have different physical structures and biochemical content and properties.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Art Unit: 1651

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUSAN HANLEY whose telephone number is (571)272-2508. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 1651

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sandra Saucier/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1651

/Susan Hanley/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1651